

From: Richard Finegold
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/24/02 3:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001

In the proposed final judgement, Microsoft isn't required to disclose the formats of its various "Office" files. For example, with Microsoft's monopoly, people have become accustomed to sending Word documents in their native format. Microsoft doesn't have a lot of documentation any more for their Word document structure, so competitors must "reverse-engineer" the structure and implement what they can. People might be satisfied with a competitor's software _with the sole exception_ of Word document interpretation, and thus might switch to Microsoft's software _solely_ on this basis. Thus, a barrier to entry is maintained.

Broadly speaking, most of the proposed settlement doesn't do much to correct or even address Microsoft's past abuses - see Dan Kegel's analysis (<http://www.kegel.com/remedy/remedy2.html>). Microsoft commits crime but is then still able to profit from it. I hope this isn't how the Justice System is intended to work. If it is (right to profit from past crimes), then Kevin Mitnick ought to have a computer (because that would enable him to profit from past crimes).

I am not happy with this proposed settlement, please consider this a "no" vote. A stronger remedy please!

Thanks!

--Richard Finegold
1400 Bellevue Way SE #4
Bellevue WA 98004